

File 8: Ei Compendex(R) 1970-1999/Sep W4  
 (c) 1999 Engineering Info. Inc.  
 File 77: Conference Papers Index 1973-1999/Sep  
 (c) 1999 Cambridge Sci Abs  
 File 238: Abs. in New Tech & Eng. 1981-1999/Aug  
 (c) 1999 Reed-Elsevier (UK) Ltd.  
 File 35: Dissertation Abstracts Online 1861-1999/Oct  
 (c) 1999 UMI  
 File 65: Inside Conferences 1993-1999/June W2  
 (c) 1999 BLDSC all rts. reserv.  
 File 2: INSPEC 1969-1999/Sep W2  
 (c) 1999 Institution of Electrical Engineers  
 File 94: JICST-EPlus 1985-1999/Jun W1  
 (c) 1999 Japan Science and Tech Corp (JST)  
 File 233: Microcomputer Abstracts 1974-1999/Sep  
 (c) 1999 Information Today Incl.  
 File 6: NTIS 64-1999/Oct W5  
 Comp&distr 1998 NTIS, Intl Copyright All Righ  
 File 144: Pascal 1973-1999/Aug  
 (c) 1999 INIST/CNRS  
 File 34: SciSearch(R) Cited Ref Sci 1990-1999/Sep W4  
 (c) 1999 Inst for Sci Info  
 File 434: SciSearch(R) Cited Ref Sci 1974-1989/Dec  
 (c) 1998 Inst for Sci Info  
 File 99: Wilson Appl. Sci & Tech Abs 1983-1999/Aug  
 (c) 1999 The HW Wilson Co.

Set	Items	Description
S1	223	(STAGGERED? OR GRADUATED? OR INCREMENT? OR INTERVAL? OR PROGRESSIVE? OR GRADUAL?) (N4) (DISCOUNT? OR REBATE? OR SPECIAL(-) OFFER? OR PROMOTION? OR VOUCHER? OR REDEMPTION? OR REFUND?)
S2	27503	(INCREAS?) (N3) (PERCENT? ? OR PERCENTAGE? OR DISCOUNT?)
S3	5259	(VISIT? OR SHOP?(N2) TRIP? OR SHOP? OR PURCHASE?) (N5) (CUSTOMER? OR CLIENT? OR SHOPPER? OR BUYER? OR CONSUMER? OR PATRON?)
S4	0	S1 AND S2 AND S3
S5	7	S1 AND S3
S6	3	S1 AND S2
S7	3	RD S5 (unique items)
S8	2	RD S6 (unique items)
?		

7/7/1 (Item 1 from file: 8)  
DIALOG(R)File 8:EI Compendex(R)  
(c) 1999 Engineering Info. Inc. All rts. reserv.

04792354 E.I. No: EIP97083789710

**Title: Classification of literature on determining the lot size under quantity discounts**

Author: Benton, W.C.; Park, Seungwook

Corporate Source: Ohio State Univ, Columbus, OH, USA

Conference Title: Proceedings of the 1996 27th Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute. Part 3 (of 3)

Conference Location: Orlando, FL, USA Conference Date: 19961124-19961126

E.I. Conference No.: 46863

Source: Proceedings - Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute v 3 1996. Decis Sci Inst, Atlanta, GA, USA. p 1385-1387

Publication Year: 1996

CODEN: PAMSED

Language: English

Document Type: CA; (Conference Article) Treatment: G; (General Review); M; (Management Aspects)

Journal Announcement: 9710W2

Abstract: Determining a lot size in the presence of either all-units or **incremental discounts** has represented one of major interests of materials managers. It is a common practice that the suppliers offer quantity discount to entice the **buyers** to **purchase** more and to achieve economics of scale for transportation and processing costs. This paper will classify the literature on lot sizing determination under several types of discount schemes and discuss some of the significant literature in this area over two decades. Also, some future research areas have been identified. (Author abstract)

7/7/2 (Item 2 from file: 8)  
DIALOG(R)File 8:EI Compendex(R)  
(c) 1999 Engineering Info. Inc. All rts. reserv.

02631148 E.I. Monthly No: EI8809083140

**Title: OPTIMAL JOINT BUYER-SELLER DISCOUNT PRICING MODEL.**

Author: Chakravarty, Amiya K.; Martin, G. E.

Corporate Source: Univ of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, USA

Source: Computers & Operations Research v 15 n 3 1988 p 271-281

Publication Year: 1988

CODEN: CMORAP ISSN: 0305-0548

Language: English

Document Type: JA; (Journal Article) Treatment: A; (Applications); E; (Economic/Cost Data/Market Survey); T; (Theoretical)

Journal Announcement: 8809

Abstract: Quantity discount models in the EOQ environment are a well-known means for a vendor to entice a **buyer** or **buyers** to **purchase** in larger quantities and less frequently, thus reducing annual inventory policy cost. The seller similarly benefits, although until fairly recently, the mechanism behind the discount structure created by the seller has been essentially ignored and the discount structure simply taken as a given. This paper provides the vendor with the means for optimally determining both the **discount** price and the replenishment **interval** under periodic review for any desired joint saving-sharing scheme between the seller and buyer(s). In the multiple-buyer case we provide an efficient algorithm for homogeneously grouping buyers, with common group order intervals, to the mutual satisfaction of all participants; that is, by further improving joint savings. (Edited author abstract) 9 refs.

7/7/3 (Item 1 from file: 35)  
DIALOG(R)File 35:Dissertation Abstracts Online  
(c) 1999 UMI. All rts. reserv.

0968072 ORDER NO: AAD87-24102

**A TECHNIQUE TO EVALUATE SALES PROMOTIONS IN TERMS OF INCREMENTAL SALES**

Author: STINEROCK, ROBERT NOEL

Degree: PH.D

Year: 1987

Corporate Source/Institution: COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY (0054)

Source: VOLUME 48/08-A OF DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS INTERNATIONAL.

PAGE 2109. 129 PAGES

This research develops a fairly simple technique for evaluating how effective a sales promotion of a frequently **purchased consumer** good has been at attracting sales with a high probability of being incremental. We define **incremental** sales as **promotion** -period sales which the brand would not have had without the promotion.

Many sales promotion studies evaluate the impact of the sales promotion in terms of short-term increase in sales volume. But an increase in sales volume can be a misleading criterion by which to judge the "success" of a sales promotion. We should also consider whether the sales promotion is reaching new users--a major source of incremental sales--or merely rewarding loyal (current) buyers.

This line of research is important for at least two reasons. First, U.S. firms are spending--and apparently will continue to spend--enormous amounts of money on sales promotion. Expenditures for sales promotion have exceeded those for advertising by an amount which has grown larger each year. That is, not only is the absolute level of expenditure on sales promotion greater than that on advertising, the rate of increase of spending on sales promotion is greater as well.

Second, few marketing practitioners really understand how to evaluate the results of their sales promotions, even though so much money is involved. Strang (1976, p. 120) observes that "evaluation of promotion programs receives little attention. Even when an attempt is made to evaluate a promotion, it is likely to be superficial."

8/7/1 (Item 1 from file: 8)

DIALOG(R)File 8:Ei Compendex(R)

(c) 1999 Engineering Info. Inc. All rts. reserv.

04535052 E.I. No: EIP96083295412

Title: **Modeling quantity discounts under general price-sensitive demand functions: optimal policies and relationships**

Author: Kevin, Weng Z.

Corporate Source: Georgia inst. technology, school management, Atlanta, GA, USA

Source: European Journal of Operational Research v 86 n 2 1995. p 300-314

Publication Year: 1995

CODEN: EJORDT ISSN: 0377-2217

Language: English

Document Type: JA; (Journal Article)

Journal Announcement: 9612W4

Abstract: This paper presents models for determining optimal all-unit and **incremental** quantity discount policies and investigates the effect of quantity discounts on increasing demand and ensuring pareto-efficient transactions under general price-sensitive demand functions. The paper develops optimal quantity discount policies, investigates their interrelationships and their benefits to both the supplier and the buyer, and gains managerial insights for the scenarios of maximizing the supplier's profit and the joint profit. We develop simple and efficient solution approaches for determining the all-unit and the incremental optimal decision policies for general price-sensitive demand functions. We have three main findings. First, with price-sensitive demand there are two incentives in offering quantity discounts : **increasing** demand and ensuring pareto-efficient transactions. In most cases, increasing demand dominates in justifying the offering of quantity discounts. Second, using a single lot size associated with all efficient transactions as with the constant demand case does not hold with the price-sensitive demand case. Third, the optimal all-unit quantity discount policy is equivalent to the optimal **incremental** quantity discount policy in benefiting both the supplier and the buyer. 19 Refs.

8/7/2 (Item 1 from file: 2)  
DIALOG(R) File 2:INSPEC  
(c) 1999 Institution of Electrical Engineers. All rts. reserv.

5102546 INSPEC Abstract Number: C9512-1290D-045

**Title: Modeling quantity discounts under general price-sensitive demand functions: Optimal policies and relationships**

Author(s): Weng, Z.K.

Author Affiliation: Sch. of Manage., Georgia Inst. of Technol., Atlanta, GA, USA

Journal: European Journal of Operational Research vol.86, no.2 p. 300-14

Publication Date: 19 Oct. 1995 Country of Publication: Netherlands

CODEN: EJORDT ISSN: 0377-2217

U.S. Copyright Clearance Center Code: 0377-2217/95/\$09.50

Language: English Document Type: Journal Paper (JP)

Treatment: Theoretical (T)

**Abstract:** This paper presents models for determining optimal all-unit and **incremental** quantity discount policies and investigates the effect of quantity discounts on **increasing** demand and ensuring pareto-efficient transactions under general price-sensitive demand functions. The paper develops optimal quantity discount policies, investigates their interrelationships and their benefits to both the supplier and the buyer, and gains managerial insights for the scenarios of maximizing the supplier's profit and the joint profit. the author develops simple and efficient solution approaches for determining the all-unit and the incremental optimal decision policies for general price-sensitive demand functions. The author has three main findings. First, with price-sensitive demand there are two incentives in offering quantity discounts : **increasing** demand and ensuring pareto-efficient transactions. In most cases, increasing demand dominates in justifying the offering of quantity discounts. Second, using a single lot size associated with all efficient transactions as with the constant demand case does not hold with the price-sensitive demand case. Third, the optimal all-unit quantity discount policy is equivalent to the optimal **incremental** quantity discount policy in benefiting both the supplier and the buyer. (19 Refs)

Copyright 1995, IEE

?

File 256:SoftBase:Reviews,Companies&Prods. 85-1999/Sep

(c)1999 Info.Sources Inc

File 278:Microcomputer Software Guide 1999/Aug

(c) 1999 Reed Elsevier Inc.

Set	Items	Description
S1	1	(STAGGERED? OR GRADUATED? OR INCREMENT? OR INTERVAL? OR PROGRESSIVE? OR GRADUAL?) (N4) (DISCOUNT? OR REBATE? OR SPECIAL(-)OFFER? OR PROMOTION? OR VOUCHER? OR REDEMPTION? OR REFUND?)
S2	297	(INCREAS?) (N3) (PERCENT? ? OR PERCENTAGE? OR DISCOUNT?)
S3	594	(VISIT? OR SHOP?(N2)TRIP? OR SHOP? OR PURCHASE?) (N5) (CUSTOMER? OR CLIENT? OR SHOPPER? OR BUYER? OR CONSUMER? OR PATRON?)
S4	0	S1 AND S2 AND S3
S5	0	S1 AND S3
S6	0	S1 AND S2